

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 09/788,002 | 02/16/2001 | Leo Driessen | CS1089#SP | 3636 |
| 7590 07/09/2004 | | | EXAMINER | |
| The Black & Decker Corporation | | | TRAN, LOUIS B | |
| 701 East Joppa Road Towson, MD 21286 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| Towson, MD 21260 | | | 3721 | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 07/09/2004 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action | 09/788,002 | DRIESSEN, LEO | | | |
| Advisory Action | Examiner | Art Unit | | | |
| | Louis B Tran | 3721 | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence address | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 04 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | oid abandonment of this application at the same of this application at the same of the sam | ation. A proper reply to a name application in | | | |
| | PLY [check either a) or b)] | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In | | | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of the eunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Official filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Official filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. | ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THe date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail | g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension on the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or | | | |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>04 June 2004</u> . Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. | | | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because: | | | | | |
| (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); | | | | | |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below); | | | | | |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or | | | | | |
| (d) they present additional claims without canceli | ng a corresponding number of fi | inally rejected claims. | | | |
| NOTE: | | | | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject | | | | | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | be allowable if submitted in a se | eparate, timely filed amendment | | | |
| 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se | | dered but does NOT place the | | | |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | ause it is not directed SOLELY t | o issues which were newly | | | |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we | (s) a) will not be entered or by ould be rejected is provided belo |) will be entered and an ow or appended. | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | |
| 8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ app | roved or b)□ disapproved by t | he Examiner. | | | |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement | nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | · | | | |
| 10. Other: | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | ه | | | |

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant contends that screws cannot be described as a "tool-less means". However, Examiner contends that a user could apply bolts by hand which would fulfill the "tool-less" requirement. Therefore, 112 rejections and 102/103 rejections are proper. Examiner still holds "the other one" to be indefinite in claim 11.

JOHN SIPOS PRIMARY EXAMINER